

**Idaho State Library  
LiLI Board Meeting  
June 4, 2002**

**Attendance:** Marsha Beckwith- Meridian School District  
Tom Olson – Boise School District  
Dan Lester – Boise State University  
Erin McCusker – Boise Basin Library District  
Ruth Funabiki – University of Idaho Law Library  
Kay Flowers – Idaho State University Library  
Tim Brown – Boise State University

ISL Staff Members:	Carol Silvers	Michael Samuelson
	Frank Nelson	Jan Wall
	Gina Persichini	Charlotte Fowles
	Sonja Hudson	Ann Joslin
	Marj Hooper	

**LiLI-D:**

**LiLI-D renewal Process:** Charlotte Fowles

Charlotte has drafted a statement identifying the categories of databases within the scope of the RFP. Based on previous RFP, World Cat is in the general interest category. Vendors have been calling and Charlotte will be going to ALA next week to speak with many of them. There are a number of large vendors that have products that would fill the holes in our current databases. Charlotte and other networking staff have already met with EBSCO and SIRS.

BCR may be able to assist in the renewal process. They have worked with other states during their bid processes. BCR information is being collected, and we are also looking at using State Purchasing. The drafting of the RFP will probably begin in June and July.

Some questions about whether or not libraries will be able to recoup some of their investment should the renewal include databases the libraries already subscribe to. Schools will continue to use SIRS and will renew their subscription regardless of the contract the state may put together. BSU spends about \$30,000 per year on ABI, too. Charlotte will start inquiring about these questions with the vendors.

The schools would rather pay the money and have duplicate databases than be without those databases that they rely on. Boise School District supplies SIRS to all schools. Government Report provides some of the schools with cost savings.

A task force will be brought together to evaluate the databases before a final decision is made.

**Marketing Plan:**

The current year was unusual as we did not have a formal marketing plan. Next year's plan will include extensive promotion of the new LiLI-D package, training and reeducating. Anne Abrams will fill us in on the details at the next Board meeting.

**Idaho Courier Backbone:**

The courier that services southern Idaho has been bought out. We need to wait a while to before we can evaluate their service. In the past, BSU has had a little trouble from the courier in terms of service and delivery times. The average delivery time in the contract is two days; we have had occasion where it takes up to 8 days.

There was some concern about the new contract being based on weight. Particularly after a weight-intensive collection is being transferred between the State Library and ISU. Email from Nancy Nathenson at ORBIS indicates that the price is not determined by weight or number of items, but by the number of drop sites. ORBIS should be making an announcement soon as to the next years' contract costs.

Members would like to know how the materials are being moved from place to place. What routes do they use?

ISU was contracting with Moore prior to the courier service. Are there assumptions that courier service will be available to organizations outside the established list? ISU is charging a minimal fee to test traffic and will re-assess as necessary.

ORBIS is sending out a survey. It was mentioned that those who receive it should respond to let their problems be known.

BSU and ISU will be able to evaluate the benefits of the Twin Falls site for their students soon. Some questions arose about increasing the activity in that region. A suggestion was made to meet with key libraries in that area after an adequate amount of evaluative information has been gathered.

In the meantime, we will gather some statistics of public library traffic between magic valley and treasure valley. The issue will be addressed at the next meeting.

**LSTA Update: Ann Joslin**

It was recommended that the suggestions proposed at the last meeting would make very competitive grant projects. The next competitive grant cycle is now underway. The recommendations for the remaining LSTA money were to upgrade LiLI Server at BSU with programming and software capacity for the statewide library database and web-server. This project's costs are anticipated to be split 50/50 between state and federal funds. The State Library will also use less than \$1,000 for remote e-mail access.

ISL is starting on the path to incorporate outcome based evaluation to applicable projects. IMLS will provide the training to ISL staff, who will, in turn, take the training out to the state.

ISL is also considering a Statewide Summit for school library staff. We haven't developed a purpose other than to bring together various people from school districts across the state. Librarian, and Administrator, perhaps a teacher to discuss issues impacting school library services.

Other LSTS project will include \$2,500 for Trustees newsletter, \$20,000 for web page development for ISL projects, and \$76,000 to be rolled into 2003 competitive grant cycle. This is a year when we will be encouraging libraries to submit their projects.

Idaho may see a small increase in LSTA funding allocation in the future. Should that happen, there will be some questions about fulfilling the match requirements.

A question was posed about the state of the State Library and library services. The State Library will be ramping down direct library services to individuals. The State Library Board decided that the role of Government services has been reduced and is giving away our collection. We will still be offering very limited library services to the rest of the state in the areas of Library science, organizational development and state documents.

The Code states that the State Library shall be the state depository. ISL is in the process of determining what it will take to do this well. At this time, no one else is doing it.

### **LiLI-Web: Gina**

In the coming year, ISL we will be looking at the LiLI Web-site for redesign. Webliographies will be added. Already working on Government Information (Charlotte), Encyclopedias (Michael) and the Court Assistance Project (Ruth Funabiki). Ruth Funabiki will be presenting a program at ILA on the Court Assistance Project.

### **ITRMC Standards: (Information Technology Resource Management Council)**

Carol Silver reported that the council includes 4 legislators, 1 private vendor, state agencies. The council Chair is Pam Ahrens, plus they have an administrative staff steer the group. In the last year they have passed several policies standards and guidelines. Policy 5010, including guidelines prohibiting agencies from linking to websites that are controversial, was a concern to ISL. ISL didn't have much time for a response, but ISL sent a letter identifying our concerns and suggesting different wording. The letter didn't arrive in the right hands in time, so the policy was pass as it stood. After follow-up discussions with key individuals, the policy will again be addressed in August. Carol has volunteered to help the council with the verbiage.

Accessibility policy – Within the discussions about redesigning the LiLI website, there is a focus on complying with the ITRMC accessibility standards.

Tracking usage statistics – BSU is using Web Trends to track usage. We average 3,300 page views per day. Dan Lester has a wealth of statistics from the past years. Dan shared a report with statistics from the past 17 months. ISL staff will review the report to determine what pages we should track more closely.

### **Resource Sharing Pilot Project: Gina**

We are going to go ahead with the Pilot Project. Soon Gina will be putting together the structure of the project. The purpose is to gather information to pass along to libraries to help them determine the time, costs, and activities involved in adding ILL services.

Some libraries would benefit from having a checklist of sorts so they know where they are on the road to achieve their resource sharing goals.

The board agreed that since many of the libraries in the state are new to resource sharing, it would be a benefit to put together a statewide guideline or ILL code. There are many examples of these available online. The committee to put this draft guideline together could be comprised of staff of the libraries involved in the project, plus a few experienced individuals.

Gina requested the Board brainstorm a list of bare minimum criteria for the libraries invited to participate in the pilot project:

- LSTA Criteria
- Must have a computer
- Some of those that were relying on LaserCat Libraries
- Willingness to loan materials
- Mix of public, school, and academic libraries
- State agency special libraries
- Should have some un-automated library
- 10 – 15 libraries
- looking for libraries that are part of a network or stand alone
- Outcomes based evaluation
- Don't want to see in participating library: Give them stuff so they can go home and play by themselves

### **Reciprocal borrowing: Ann Joslin**

Deputy Attorney General has been working on this for quite some time and continues to think a Joint Powers agreement is the best way to go since the proposal is to have the State Library as fiscal agent for the replacement fund. The Deputy Attorney General has also suggested that the State Library not be a part of the Joint Power Agreement, he feels that will keep ISL from being liable. With the agreement, a new entity is created that can

go on to create its own bank account. The Joint Powers he recommends would be only for reciprocal borrowing. Should we decide to add resource sharing or other services later on, they would require their own Joint Powers. Plus, the LiLI Board should not be the board governing the Joint Powers.

Concern was expressed about the growing complications. Will we lose participation because the process has become so complicated?

It was noted that other areas of the state have reciprocal borrowing already in place, and that other parts of the state will have little desire for the service. How far do we want to pursue this with the Deputy Attorney General's office? The suggestion from his office is to take some action through statute. That is, to give the State Library some responsibilities and right that they currently do not have.

Another option is to find a different organization to be the fiscal agent. It was noted that if the signing of the Agreement isn't advisable for the State Library, it wouldn't be appropriate for any other state institution. If another library handles the account, the Deputy Attorney General advises that they take the agreement to their own attorney. If another library was willing to administer and hold the fund, he would not have a problem with our participation short of signing the reciprocal borrowing agreement.

There was a suggestion to hire an insurance company. This might be difficult to purchase as a group. Maybe individual libraries could purchase on their own?

There seems to be a need to address the unserved. This is a big part of what the draft addresses along with the responsibilities. Library Boards need a document to review, to know that the service is taking place

The replacement cost for lost books was the area in the agreement Sherm felt that would carry the most liability for the State. Seeking out other organization that may be willing to be the fiscal agent is an option. The LiLI Board is ineligible as it is not a legal entity and could not establish a legal bank account.

We may want to look at some legislation that would address some of the issues of statewide service that we may want to provide in the future. Doing this could eliminate many of the problems we experienced with this agreement.

It is the opinion of the group that we do not want to pursue with our Attorney General any deviation of this agreement. If it is not good enough for the State Library, it is not good enough for another agency.

## **ILA Conference: Gina**

We have a program slot reserved for LiLI. What kind of program would we like to provide?

Suggestions include:

- Demonstrations by vendors who are finalists for the LiLI-D renewal
- Demonstration of the updated LiLI Website if available
- Possibly an update on reciprocal borrowing
- Possibly something on the Resource Sharing Pilot Project
- Invite libraries to participate and explain resource sharing.

LiLI will also have a booth to demonstrate and share information.

## **LiLI Board Positions**

Erin McCusker, Ruth Funabiki re-appointed, Tom Olsen re-appointed Kay Flowers re-appointed. We are proposing that this be the membership for the next year.

## **State Library Update: Ann Joslin**

WE started out with a 4% holdback in the current fiscal year that came in two different stages. The most recent spending restrictions we are ending up with a 6% holdback for the current year. The latest move froze funds in the existing categories. Our appropriation is a 17% cut; removing one-time expenditures and capital. This equates to the initial 6% and an additional 11%. We may start the year with an additional holdback. We are left with a minimal amount of operating, no capital funds, and it seems obvious that we will have to give up some more positions. Personnel is the only place we will have money to move funds to capital.

**Next LiLI Meeting:** September 12, 2002 Thursday. 9:00 – 4:00

## **LiLI Work Plan:**

The group reviewed the LiLI Work Plan. Prior to the meeting, Ann Joslin prepared some recommendations for changes. Working from that document, the following changes were suggested by the Board:

Pages 1-2, no changes.

Service 1 – LiLI Website (Page 3)

- Outcome: remove Lili services, such as LiLI-D and LiLI Z
- Activities: Something about regular statistical analysis 02-03 Parallel to Track usage of the lili website. **Ongoing activity**

- Redesign LiLI Website Activities
- 2002-2003 Activities guild lines change to guide lines.

#### Service 2 - Electronic resources (LiLI databases, GIS other)

- Putting under ongoing activities Track usage of the LiLI Website.
- Why GIS in heading no where else in #2. Put there to give context to what resources might cover. Inside Idaho.
- Remove (LiLI databases, GIS ...) from title. Of #2
- Outcome 1.. results in cost savings... there for tactical or political affect.

#### Service 3 - Virtual catalog

- Ongoing activities: Maintain LiLI Z page doesn't cost to maintain so ok to leave in.

#### Service 4 - Delivery service

- **2002-2003 Activity:** Evaluating the prospect of possibility of adding additional drop sites. **Investigate the expansion of the courier service.**

#### Service 5 - Statewide Walk-in Access

#### Service 6 - Electronic ILL requests

- Criteria for participation take out P-ILL change to electronic interlibrary loan as under strategy.
- Criteria for participation : cut may also require Z39.50 capability.
- Implement a pilot resource project is new should be underlined.
- Develop a plan for implementing remote..... move to 2004

#### Service 7 - Regional library network suport for libraries

- 2002-2003
- Limited to ongoing activities

#### Service 8 - Training and education in networked services

- 2002-2003 activities
- Coordinate and provide additional training

#### Service 9 - Technical support

- Ongoing activity:

- Provide/contract for technical support strike contract and technical and lili servers.  
**Provide for support of technology implemented at the state level.**
- Developing FAQ's and other help sheets on LiLI web for quick lookups.
- Develop LibIdaho as a technical information resource... change support to information.

Meeting Adjourned

Next Meeting: September 12<sup>th</sup>, 9am – 4pm